IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

and
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION NO : 17795 of 2004

Between:

P.Sivaiah, S/o Ramaiah,
R/o 4-2-124, Opp.Dr.Y.Murlidharrao Hospital, Bodhan, Nizamabad District

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 District and Sessions Judge, Nizamabad
2 Registrar (Administration), High Court of Andhra Pradesh,

Hyderabad
3 Employment Officer, Regional Employment Exchange,

Nizamabad
4 Y.Nagendra, S/o Seshaiah,
R/o 2-2-184/A/2, Amberpet, Hyderabad
5 S.Srinivas, S/o S.Bhaskar,
R/o H.No.7-2-1087/1, Soubhagyanagar Police Station,

Hyderabad

..RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or Direction in the nature of Mandamus or otherwise declaring the action of the Respondents 1 and 2 in appointing the Respondents 4 and 5 in preference to the Petitioner herein, out of the way and ignoring the panel of candidates, as Attenders/ Process Services, is illegal, arbitrary, violative of Principles of natural justice and also Art.16 of Constitution of India and therefore,

direct the respondents herein to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment as Attender/ Process Server and be pleased to pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.BALRAJ BHODANKAR

Counsel for the Respondent Nos 1&2: MR.C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: G.P. for Employment & Training

The Court at the admission stage made the following :

Oral Order: (per BRSR.J)

We find no merit in this writ petition. The petitioner's belated challenge to the appointments of respondents 4 and 5 cannot be entertained at this stage after a period of more than eight years of selection and appointment of respondents 4 and 5.

Be it as it may, the whole of the claim of the petitioner is based upon the panel drawn on 11.6.1993 in which he is shown at serial No.5 and respondent No.5 herein is shown at serial No.13. It is true that the name of the 4th respondent is not found in that list prepared in the year 1993 but as has been rightly pointed out by the learned standing counsel, the life of the panel came to an end in 1994 itself. The selection and appointment of respondents 4 and 5 is based upon the panel drawn in the year 1996.

Viewed from any angle, we find no merit in this writ petition. The same shall accordingly stand dismissed. No costs.

(B.SUDERSHAN REDDY,J)

Dated 04..10..2004

(K.C.BHANU,J)

msv.

..... REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To

1 District and Sessions Judge, Nizamabad

2 Registrar (Administration), High Court of Andhra Pradesh,

Hyderabad

3 Employment Officer, Regional Employment Exchange,

Nizamabad

4. 2 CCs to G.P. for Employment & Training, High Court of A.P. Hyd.(OUT)

5. 2CD copies.